THE Reconstructionist

. XII. December 27, 1946 Tebet 4, 5707 No. 17

EDITORIALS
- *What Hanukkah Does Not Teach*
- *The Zionist Congress in Session*
- *Achievements of the U.N. Assembly*

GREAT-GRANDMOTHER'S (*poem*)
By Morrison D. Bial

HALUTZIUT FOR AMERICAN JEWS
By Jack J. Cohen

THIS, OUR LAST STAND, a Reply to Rabbis Eisenstein and Agus
By Abraham G. Duker

RANDOM THOUGHTS *By M. M. K.*

BOOK NOTES *By Eugene Kohn*

REALITIES AND VALUES *CORRESPONDENCE*

Supplement:
IN THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST MOVEMENT

odicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of ael's ancient homeland, and to the furthe ance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $2.00 per year; 10c per copy; foreign 25c extra; membership in the Foundation, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**

Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**

Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Jack J. Cohen, Nathan E. Cohen, Samuel Dinin, Abraham C. Duker, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Roland B. Gittelsohn, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Aharon Kessler, Samuel C. Kohs, Myer S. Kripke, Edward T. Sandrow, Judah Shapiro, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Morris Adler, Michael per, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel Blumenfield, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxman, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Croll Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah Goldin, Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Milton Konvitz, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis Joshua Loth Liebman, Sidney Morgenbesser Maurice Pekarsky, David Polish, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Executive Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

MORRISON D. BIAL is assistant rabbi of t Beth Sholom—Peoples' Temple, Brookly New York.

A NEW STUDY COURSE

THE PHILOSOPHY AND PROGRAM OF RECONSTRUCTIONISM

presented

through the correspondence method

including

SUGGESTIONS FOR READING, QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION, SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR ADDITIONAL STUDY.

Course is given gratis to all members of

THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST YOUTH INSTITUTE

Any interested person may obtain the material for a fee of $3.00.

For additional information, write:

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

A NEW SERVICE

RECONSTRUCTIONIST BOOK DEPARTMENT

All books reviewed in *The Reconstructionist* and all other books of current interest may be obtained on order from

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

All books will be shipped postpaid upon receipt of order and remittance.

THE

Reconstructionist

XII. December 27, 1946 Tebet 4, 5707 No. 17

ITORIALS

AT HANUKKAH DOES T TEACH

HANUKKAH, 1946 is bound to suggest compar- of the events of our day with those ne year 165 B.C.E., when the Macca- ns successfully resisted the Syrian eks in Palestine. From lecture plat- ns all over the country, orators are otless referring to our times as an- r crisis in the long struggle of Juda- and the Jewish people to survive, ng upon the Jews of our day to late the gallant Maccabeans, identify- the resistance movement in Eretz ael with the guerilla warfare of the cabean heroes. The historic analogy, ever, is far from perfect.

here is no denying, of course, that larities exist. In both instances we a foreign power seeking to domin- and the Jews seeking to over- w this domination. In both in- ces the spirit of revolt flared up, and oth instances acts of great heroism e been performed. But in this moment ain and sorrow for the Jewish people, cannot well afford to treat our his- merely as a source for propaganda. ur history is to mean anything to us, must seek to interpret the events of past in their true context and not merely invoke them as inspiration for the particular policy which requires corroboration and support at the moment.

So interpreted, those events present two striking contrasts to the present situation. First, in the Maccabean age the Jews lived in Eretz Yisrael and no question was raised as to their right to live there. The Syrian Greeks were therefore clearly interlopers, an invading and dominating power. Today our essential problem is that a large number of the Jews who ought to be in Palestine are not yet there. They are held in concentration camps and DP camps all over Europe. The Jews of North Africa and other depressed areas who want to go to Palestine find that the essential problem they face is how to break down the barriers that keep them out. Second, the government that now dominates did not come into the land as an individual conquering nation, but was invited by the nations of the world to watch over this land and to prepare the eventual transfer of sovereignty to the resident population when the Jews would be a majority, as it was intended that they should become. We can, therefore, count today on an international conscience which was not in operation in the days of the Maccabees. That conscience is today in many respects even more sensitive and potentially more powerful than it was when Great Britain was given the Mandate. This is not a struggle between

Israel and Great Britain. It is a struggle between the universal forces that make for good and those that make for evil. The primitive weapons of violence which served the Maccabeans will not necessarily serve the Yishuv of today.

Those who insist that the present situation constitutes a perfect parallel to the warfare of the Maccabeans against a mercenary army of Syrians, conclude that sooner or later Great Britain, like ancient Syria, would be forced to yield before the fanaticism of the defending forces. They find additional analogies in the history of the American Revolution and of the Irish Revolt. They are prepared to have the Jewish people declare war against the British. They do not realize that the use of analogies is a two-edged sword, that history can provide more than enough instances of rebellions which did *not* succeed, however worthy and justified they were.

Indeed the very history which the present advocates of violence bring forward as evidence militates against them. Let them read the books of Maccabees, or the Wars of the Jews by Josephus and see what the Maccabean war cost. Are they prepared for the Yishuv to pay that price? What happened when the war was finally won? Did the victory enable Israel to live a peaceful and independent existence for centuries more? Or was the country so weakened by the strife and by the subsequent internal strife resulting from the habit of violence, that the Jewish state fell victim almost at once to the greed of Rome? Granted even that a successful war against the British could be carried out, a most fantastic assumption, would this then set up a powerful government for the Jews, which could resist the incursions of other powers who might want to take advantage of an exhausted people and a desolate country? Why do not the advocates of unrestrained violence refer to other eras in the histo of our people when the sensitivity to th evil of destructive rage was greater tha at the time of the Maccabees? The fo lowing *midrash* which describes the r union of Esau and Jacob must have ari en in one of those eras. According to th *midrash,* when the Torah says, "Jaco was afraid and grieved," the rabbis in terpret the first phrase, ". . . was afraid to mean he was afraid he might be kille and the second, "he was grieved," t mean he was grieved lest he be compelle to kill others.

Let us not be misunderstood. The ga lantry of the Yishuv is magnificent; thei courage and their fortitude unparallele The way they risk their lives to rescu their fellow-Jews and bring them into th country has perhaps no precedent in Jew ish or other history. Their uninterrupte settlement of the land, their establishmen of new industries and new enterprises i breathtaking for its boldness and daring But the cheap bravado of the militan spirit that prompts young boys and girl to throw bombs indiscriminately and t take the lives of innocent people is no in the least ennobled by any spuriou comparisons of these youngsters and thei leaders with the Maccabees of old.

As this is written reports come out o Basle from the World Zionist Congres which indicate that the struggle goes on in the councils of Zionist leadership, the struggle between those who would throw discretion to the winds and those who still hope to carry on in the spirit of negotiation and compromise. Yielding to seductive delusions today, disporting ourselves like Maccabees with swords and spears may cost this and the next generation dearly. Let us proceed with the building of the country, bringing in immigrants, and let us carry on an unceasing clamor in the legislative halls of the civilized world. Let us appeal without

cessation to the conscience of Christian readers. Let us do everything that might advance the cause. But let us not be trapped into resorting to that insane kind of terror which depraves us and at the same time degrades our cause in the eyes of the world. Let us not forget that Hanukkah also means rededication to the religious ideals of our tradition, and that among those ideals is faith in the power of the word and the spirit to move mountains and even to move the hearts of men.

THE ZIONIST CONGRESS IN SESSION

AS this is being written, the Zionist Congress is still in session at Basle. The general debate has been concluded, but no resolutions have yet been passed, nor has the new Executive been elected. It is therefore impossible to evaluate the work of the Congress or discuss the next steps that have to be taken on the basis of its decisions.

The general debate has made the issues before the Congress very clear. They all revolve about the question of Jewish participation in the Palestine Conference with Arabs and Jews which has been scheduled by the British government to resume its sessions next month. There are two extreme views on this question and one middle-of-the-road opinion.

There are those who completely despair of any good coming from the Conference, who believe that Great Britain is determined to destroy the whole Zionist movement and who feel that we must put our reliance on resistance in Palestine and on an anti-British political orientation in America and elsewhere. The only condition on which they would participate in the London Conference would be if it were based on the establishment of a Jewish state in the whole of Palestine.

At the other extreme are those who feel that we can accomplish nothing in opposition to Great Britain, that we must participate in the Conference, and should leave our representatives in it unbound by any specific commitments, that the only effect of our failure to attend would be the imposition by the British of their own "solution" of the problem, which would be disastrous to our cause.

The intermediate position maintains that we should lay down strict conditions as to the agenda of the Conference before accepting the invitation to participate in it. Such conditions would have to include provision for some form of Jewish state. How large such a state should be and how it should function in relation to Great Britain and the Arabs might be left for discussion at the Conference itself, but no suggestion of a further partition of Palestine should come from us, nor should our representatives accept as a solution anything less than the establishment of a "viable Jewish state in an adequate area of Palestine."

It is idle for us to discuss here which of these courses should be followed. The delegates to the Congress will and should decide these questions on the basis of information and arguments presented to them by the leaders of all Zionist parties and not on the basis of opinions arrived at in places remote from the focal center of the movement, which today is located at Basle.

We can therefore only stress the importance of loyal action in the days to come in support of whatever decision the Congress may reach. Trying days are before us. Zionism is passing through a severe crisis. At no time has unity been of greater importance. And it must be a unity of maximum inclusiveness and maximum participation, not one based on a purge of "opposition" leaders. We hope that the Congress elections will result in a coalition Executive which will insure

that all elements in the movement will cooperate in backing whatever policy has been set by the Congress, the ultimate authority in Zionism.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE U.N. ASSEMBLY

THE recent UN Assembly took some concrete steps toward breaking down the system of uncompromising national sovereignty which has been largely responsible for so many wars. By arriving amicably at its decisions after open and often heated debate, the Assembly has strengthened the hands of world government and helped to create an atmosphere in which public opinion, rather than military might, can prevail. As a result, the world looks forward to the future in a more optimistic frame of mind than at any time since the atomic bomb levelled Hiroshima. Nevertheless, that optimism must be tempered by a realistic appraisal of the problems which still remain to be solved.

The Assembly asked the Security Council to formulate practical measures for the reduction of armaments and the elimination of atomic weapons and other methods of mass destruction. The Assembly called also for international inspection and other safeguards, against which the veto power cannot be employed. Russia made a significant concession by giving up the veto in this instance, although she generally guards very jealously the right to veto, as her guarantee against domination by the Western powers. It is to be hoped that the United States, as possessor of the atomic bomb, will now take the initiative in the moral offensive against war. Having obtained Russia's capitulation on the important veto issue, our government could create an even more wholesome atmosphere for the Security Council's deliberations by declaring an immediate end to further manufacture of the atomic bomb.

The Assembly tabled for consideration by the Security Council the question of the strength of armed forces. If atomic weapons are outlawed, as we have reason to hope, the strength of existing national armies and navies would be of paramount importance. This issue may prove to be a stumbling block to world peace but it need offer no insuperable obstacle. If the more threatening problem of armaments can be settled amicably, that of competitive military man-power certainly can. Eventually there will have to be an international police force to replace national armies as guarantor of national security.

In a compromise resolution on Spain, the Assembly denounced the Franco regime and suggested that the chiefs of all diplomatic missions be recalled from Madrid. This is mild treatment for a tyrannical government which came to power largely through the help of the Nazi-Fascist Axis. However, some consolation can be derived from the fact that the climate of opinion among the delegates was definitely antagonistic to Franco. Our own government's reluctance to act against the Franco regime will, we hope, be overcome to the extent of conforming with the UN Assembly's resolution.

Three matters of direct concern to the Jewish people were decided upon by the Assembly. First was the approval of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, framed by a UN committee last spring in London. One of the principles guiding the work of the IRO is that refugees cannot be forcibly repatriated. The implications of this principle for the Jewish DPs are obvious. They will have to be admitted into Eretz Yisrael or accepted in large numbers by countries whose doors are now closed. Unfortunately for the Jewish cause, as the American Jewish Conference indi-

ates, the IRO adopted a resolution stating that, when resettlement is directed toward a non-self-governing territory, the view of the indigenous population of that territory be given due consideration. This harmless-looking clause was, of course, inspired by the Arab countries, and although a little weaker than the original formulation can serve as a stumbling block for future Jewish immigration into Eretz Yisrael.

It is to be regretted that the IRO Charter makes no adequate provision for proper care for the DP's. With the abolition of UNRRA, the obligation of relief has been left to each government. The role of our own government in this demise of UNRRA is not one of which we can be proud. The United States rejected proposals to create an emergency food fund and to provide for further international allocations of relief after the closing down of UNRRA. Instead, our government supported the creation of a technical committee to report on the food needs of the countries of the world. Since the committee lacks any authority to requisition food and order it sent to needy areas, the United States, has thus refused to delegate power to an international authority in a matter that is of vital concern to the peace and security of the world.

A second achievement of the UN which concerns the Jewish people, is the setting up of the Trusteeship Council. The trusteeship system, very similar to the mandate system of the old League, applies to former mandated areas (provided the mandatory power agrees), areas detached from enemy states after World War II and areas *voluntarily* placed under the trusteeship system by the administrative powers. Here it is Great Britain which has refused to surrender any of its sovereignty. Great Britain has stated that it will make its recommendations to the Trusteeship Council after the forthcoming talks with the Arabs and Jews in January, and then only if it so desires. Great Britain will obviously not consent to UN discussion of Palestine unless she can be assured of strengthening her own position. The Jewish plight is made doubly difficult because we have no status in the UN, while the Arabs, through Iraq, are represented directly on the Trusteeship Council itself. There is, therefore, considerable doubt that the UN can serve at the moment as a guarantor of Jewish rights in Eretz Yisrael. Nevertheless, the presence of the Arabs in the UN, makes it likely that the Palestine problem wil be brought up whether or not the British themselves turn to the Trusteeship Council.

Finaly, of interest to us as Jews is a concrete contribution of the Assembly to the development of an effective international law. In a unanimous resolution, the Assembly declared that genocide is a violation of international law. In calling member nations to legislate against genocide, the Assembly defined the crime as "a denial of the right of existence of entire human groups, as homicide is the denial of the right to live of individual human beings." This is only the first step in what must become a relentless drive toward the implementation of an international bill of rights. Once such a bill of rights is adopted and incorporated in international treaties or conventions, provision must be made for its enforcement by some agency of UN.

While the UN Assembly left untouched some vital problems and dealt inadequately with others, this session has at least removed the fear of so many people that the Assembly would be only a rubber stamp for the Security Council. There can be no doubt now that the airing of the views of all nations whether big or little, serves a constructive purpose. We Jews look forward to the future with the hope and prayer that our own people

will soon be permitted the dignity of having a voice in the council of nations.

REALITIES AND VALUES

THE BRITISH COUNCIL OF Christians and Jews adopted a resolution condemning "certain irresponsible Jewish groups" in Palestine for engaging in terrorist activity. It had the good grace to state that the crimes committed were the acts of "a numerically insignificant minority." The resolution, which was proposed by Dr. Geoffrey Francis Fisher, Archbishop of Canterbury, declared the acts of terrorism to be "fundamental violations of the spiritual and ethical principles common to Judaism and Christianity." We are in agreement with what the resolution has to say on that point. But what the resolution omits offends us. Are not the brutal acts of tyranny of the British military regime in Palestine—the clubbing and gassing of refugees who seek to enter their legitimate national home, the arbitrary arrest and detention of communal leaders without charge or trial, the looting and wanton destruction of property by armed troops, the unilateral breach of international covenants — also "fundamental violations of the spiritual and ethical principles common to Christianity and Judaism?" If to engage in terrorism is reprehensible—and it is—to provoke terrorism by injustice is no less reprehensible. The one unpardonable sin, according to Jewish tradition, is that of provoking the public to sin.

▼

TERRORISM IS WRONG AND must be suppressed, but acquiescence in injustice is also wrong. Where is the Jewry of Palestine to draw the line between terrorism and a legitimate resistance to tyranny and oppression? We believe that a recent statement issued by Hashomer Hatzair makes a clear and just distinction. This is what it says in part: ". . . There is only one way to achieve Zionism, the struggle for *aliyah,* and its defense by all means and under all circumstances. Our hope lies in the small struggling boats persistently steering toward the Homeland; in the epic of colonization which has created hundreds of settlements in Palestine thus far, and which will create hundreds more; and in the truly heroic and invincible 'Operation Land' in the Negev. *Toward this actual fundamental fulfilment of our hope the heroes of National Military Organization (Irgun) have contributed absolutely nothing.* . . . We shall use our arms only in the defense of these: *Aliyah, Hityashvut* and *Haganah* — immigration, colonization and defense—not for the perpetration of cold-blooded murders and futile sabotage."

▼

NOTWITHSTANDING THE UNfriendly agitation of Arab political leaders, there are happy auguries of eventual fraternal relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine, once the ultimate political destiny of the country is decided. One of these hopeful signs was Arab participation in the reception accorded by the Municipal Council of Haifa to David Hacohen on his release from the Latrun detention camp where he had been confined by government order since June 29th. Both Jewish and Arab members of the Municipal Council are reported in the bulletin of the Histadrut News Service, *Labor in Palestine* (December 4, 1946), as having stated that "in spite of his arrest, the basis of joint Jewish-Arab cooperation on the Municipal Council had not been affected, but had in fact been further strengthened."

▼

THE EUTHANASIA SOCIETY OF America advocates giving physicians the right under certain circumstances to ad-

minister a painless death to patients suffering from incurable and painful diseases. It has recently been vigorously attacked by the Right Rev. Msgr. Robert E. McCormick, presiding judge of the Ecclesiastical Tribunal of the Archdiocese of New York. He condemned euthanasia as "medical murder" and expressed surprise that other religious denominations "have not risen in public to defend the commandment of God, 'Thou shalt not kill.'" We acknowledge the sacredness of human life but we also acknowledge the sacredness of human compassion. The problem is oversimplified by Msgr. McCormick. The 6th commandment, correctly translated, does not say, "Thou shalt not kill" but "Thou shalt not murder" and not all homicide is murder. The 6th Commandment does not define murder. That is still left to human judgment and no sane person would put euthanasia, which is inspired by love and sympathy, in the same ethical category with murder, which is inspired by hate and malice. All of which must not be construed as an advocacy of euthanasia. There are legitimate arguments against legalizing that practice, based on the difficulty of framing a law that is not open to abuse. But we cannot admit the validity of Msgr. McCormick's argument from Scripture.

▼

THE WOMEN'S DIVISION OF Christian Service of the Methodist Board of Missions and Church Extension has protested against holding the annual convention of the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace in the city of Washington because of racial segregation in that city. Our hats are off to this Methodist group. It is a national scandal that, in our capital, the capital of the most powerful democracy in the world, no Negro can be assured decent and courteous treatment in any public hotel, restaurant

(*Continued on Page* 27)

Great Grandmother's

By MORRISON D. BIAL

These candlesticks, beaten brass,
Glittering in their candles' light,
What count the years that steadily pass,
The weekly measured tallow mass,
Calendar-consuming, bright?

The hands that arched above the flame
Invoking a hoped-for blessing,
Gone they are to uncertain fame,
My memory recalls but a loved name
And the touch of aged hands, caressing.

But yet the candles' Friday task
Is new performed; the brightness shed,
The table halo'd as fish, fruit and fowl bask
In supernal glow. And I, I but ask
That this light be lit long after I too be dead.

Halutziut for American Jews

By JACK J. COHEN

SEMANTICS has successfully demonstrated that words change in meaning with changes in the objective conditions to which they refer. Particularly is this true of terms which denote social values, institutions or movements. We are all familiar with the new content which every historical situation confers upon such ideas as justice, freedom, slavery, etc.

But the proponents of a social movement do not often possess sufficiently broad vision to adjust consciously their original conception in a way which may help to give the movement greater significance and thereby insure its perpetuation. To do so requires not only an open mind and courage, but an ability to grasp the objective factors with which the movement must deal. Jews who are today concerned with *halutziut,* the effort to bring Jews to Palestine as pioneers, must make the attempt to evaluate its philosophy, understand its implications and readjust its program in the light of those implications and the objective conditions which face the Jewish people.

Halutziut and Nationalism

Zionism has frequently been subject to attack on the ground that it is a reversion to nationalism in an era when the evils of nationalism have become pronounced. The argument has been used at one time or another by almost all of the opponents of Zionism. The Christian Century, the American Council for Judaism, and many liberals have invoked the charge of chauvinism against Zionism.

These arguments have been answered again and again by Zionists in terms of the premises which the argument assumes. But Zionists ought not place themselves in a position where they are constantly on the defensive. Zionism is not a typical expression of nationalism, nor does it follow the usual tactics of other nationlist movements. It has implications which may well serve to revolutionize the whole concept of nationhood and which may contribute to a solution of the perplexing problem of sovereignty. Nowhere are these implications more clearly seen than in *halutziut.*

When the first organized attempt at *halutziut* in the United States was made, all that was envisioned was the preparation of American Jewish youth for pioneering work on the soil of Palestine. Most Zionists still view *halutziut* from this perspective. Jewish youth are asked to leave their native America to assist in the rebuilding of the Jewish homeland by settling permanently on the soil of Eretz Yisrael. This is *halutziut* in its simplest form.

It takes no imagination to see the line of attack which anti-Zionists could use and have used against *halutziut.* Jews are accused of lack of patriotism. How, if we are loyal citizens of our country, can we encourage American citizens to leave their homeland and take up citizenship in a foreign land? In truth, if we accede to the standards of patriotism which prevail at the present time throughout the world, there is no answer to this question. Witness the efforts in countries under Russian domination to prvent Jewish emigration of any kind. Witness, too, the absurd, but far too widely accepted, denunciation of Zionists who aid Jews to escape from the anti-Semitic hotbed of Poland. And in our own country, as if to anticipate and guard against criticism, the Zionists

have reiterated time and again their claim that Palestine is for the poor, suffering Jews of Europe. American Jews, they say, have no intention of renouncing their allegiance to the United States.

Some European nations have justified their opposition to any Jewish emigration, *halutziut* included, on the ground that the Jewish population is needed to help rebuild the shattered communities. One can hardly sympathize with this line of reasoning on the part of those populations which only recently thought so little of the creative potentialities of the Jews that they supported and often initiated persecution of Jews.

And one can imagine the effect on American public opinion of an all-out Zionist campaign for *halutziut*. There is little likelihood of any hearty approval of such a measure—unless it be approved by anti-Semites who urge the disappearance of Jews from the American scene.

Reason, therefore, dictates that to support *halutziut* implies a conception of nationalism and patriotism which will not frown on the transference of allegiance from one country to another. One of the principles upon which this post-war world must be built is the right of every individual to emigrate freely, within the broad limits set by the absorptive capacity of his destination. The jealous nationalisms now exhibited indicate how far the world still is from such a conception. Russia leads the opposition to it in refusing to allow emigration, and all nations alike share the guilt of shutting their gates to more than a trickle of immigrants. Our world is made up of large underpopulated and overpopulated areas, both of which produce conditions harmful to the progress of mankind. The stupidity of a world which permits the fertile soil of the vast Arab dominions to remain fallow and allows Arab leaders to prevent Jewish reclamation of Palestine desert lands must be exposed. Zionists, by the very nature of their movement, must call for an enlightened view toward the redistribution of populations, something which can be accomplished only if nationalism assumes a cultural rather than political character, and if the fixing of national boundary lines will be adjusted to the needs of all peoples.

Jewish Nationalism Unique

Halutziut must assume the attack by pointing to the unique nationalism of the Jewish people. We are an international people, geographically speaking, and if we call for a Jewish national home it is to preserve our status as an international people that we do so. This seeming paradox is one of the revolutionary implications of Zionism. On the one hand, we suffer from national homelessness; until the millenium arrives, Jews will continually face the danger of extinction either by persecution or cultural pressure, unless we have a homeland of our own, through which we can have a voice in the affairs of nations and in which we can exercise our own creative powers as a people. On the other hand, Jews living in the diaspora (Nazi-infected Europe excepted) are as attached to their homelands as other citizens. They want to remain citizens of these countries, but they want also to be Jews. They recognize that their Judaism will not be as complete as that of Palestinian Jewry, but they are content to place this limit on their Judaism, provided they can live as free and equal participants in the full culture of their birthplaces. As Jews, however, their creative potential as a minority group is small. Hence they want one community in Eretz Yisrael from which inspiration will come for their continued living as Jews.

This right to an international existence is as yet not understood by the non-Jewish

world, which insists on stereotyping groups in terms of the limited categories of a sociology that assumes the inevitable assimilation of ethnic minorities whenever they are uprooted from their home environment. But sociologists have been unable to find the right pigeonhole for the Jewish people who have not as yet responded to this "iron law." The Jews have maintained their cultural institutions and identity to a greater degree than any other ethnic group. The nations of the world, in groping for an understanding of the nature of the Jews, have sought to identify them in the light of accepted sociological definitions, among which are found descriptions that render plausible the particular bias of the majority community. It was hoped that, with the proper characterization, the Jewish populations could be handled. In eastern Europe, they were looked upon as a national minority, since the existence of national minorities was part of the pattern of that pre-World War II area. In Nazi Germany they were viewed by the Nazis primarily as a racial group. In many democratic countries today the Jews are asked by Jews and non-Jews to limit their activities to those of a "religious" nature.

In the face of all this, the Jewish people must assert courageously its true character, which is at present unique. We are a nation, and as such have a right to all the opportunities for creative self-fulfilment that only majority status in a homeland can insure. But we have, as well, religion, language, art and other interests in common, which enrich our lives even while we enjoy the benefits of the majority cultures outside our homeland. However, because the homeland is not yet secure, because the world refuses to act in behalf of the Jewish right to live, *halutziut* is the most vivid *j'accuse* of which we are capable. Through *halutziut* we announce to the world that we reject the spirit of that nationalism which would stifle the will of a people to live. Through it, we assert our sense of responsibility for the future of our Jewish heritage, even to the extent of asking some of our youth to renounce their allegiance to the American state and the American Jewish community. For we know that a world which refuses the Jew the right to a place in the sun is an insecure world for all. By calling upon Jews to leave American soil for Eretz Yisrael we are appealing, not to Jewish chauvinism, but to a high American idealism—to an idealism which sees the future in terms of cultural self-fulfilment for all peoples.

Many Zionists will proclaim that *halutziut* has nothing to say about Jewish life in the diaspora, that its proponents are generally *sholele hagalut* (negators of the diaspora). It is not to be denied that such is the view of a large number of Zionists. However, it can readily be seen that the appeal for manpower from American Jewry is not necessarily connnected with denial of a Jewish life here. But supporters of *halutziut* should be aware of what is involved in calling for a Jewish homeland without at the same time asserting the Jewish right to live elsewhere as Jews. That attitude accepts the dictates of a misconceived sociological theory, rather than the Jewish will to live, as the determinant of the future of Judaism in the diaspora. There is no logical or democratic reason why Jews must accede to the request of a Benes or a Koestler that they either go to Eretz Yisrael or assimilate. So to yield is to ignore the possibilities for survival inherent in the Jewish religion and culture (especially with Eretz Yisrael to give them added strength). It is, in effect, a cowardly surrender to cultural totalitarianism.

Thus *halitziut* calls for internationalism —in terms of the inner life of the Jewish

ople and of the relations among the tions of the world. The latter must rec- nize the right of all peoples to self- cermination within the framework of world-state. *Halutziut* can help give eaning to this ideal by continuing the uggle for the rebuilding of Eretz srael in the face of accusations of chau- nism and lack of patriotism. For *lutziut* is possible only when chauvin- m itself is replaced by a general recog- tion that both individuals and groups ve the right to develop themselves. nd when that time comes, patriotism ll be recognized not as a blind adher- ce to the ideology and practices of a rticular group but as an enlightened rticipation in the life of the community nich most significantly enhances one's rsonality. In regard to Jewish life, *lutziut* must, if it is to be consistent, ll for continued Jewish survival on an ternational basis.

It is significant that *halutziut* has been fficially sponsored and most openly ad- nced by labor Zionists. It is significant, ecause, of all branches of Zionism, the bor Zionist outlook has been most in- rnational in scope. Where general Zion- ts, religious Zionists, and cultural Zion- ts have, in practice at least, confined eir efforts to the Zionist front, labor ionism, both in and out of Palestine, has een marked by its attachment to broad ternational labor and socialist move- ents. Here again, we have the seeming aradox of a combination of nationalism nd internationalism. The paradox, how- ver, is only apparent. For it is akin to he paradox of the nationalist Hebrew rophets who enunciated universal moral udgments. The truth is that labor Zion- ts have not taken sufficient pains to in- icate that Zionism is a revolutionary ovement, whose purpose it is to build secure home for Jews in a world which does not yet recognize their right to se- curity as a group, and at the same time, to insure the kind of world order in which all peoples can be secure.

Halutziut and American Jewry

Halutziut has a long road to travel be- fore it will become an accepted part of the thinking of American Jewry. After the current emergency, which has led some Zionist leaders to stifle the appeal for American *halutzim* for Palestine, there is much spade work to be done in educat- ing American Jews to the need for *halutziut.*

It is becoming increasingly apparent that, aside from the political difficulties confronting Zionism, the movement must find some way of increasing the Jewish population in Eretz Yisrael. Our task is, therefore, to secure an international com- mitment for Palestine as the Jewish na- tional homeland (with immigration in Jewish hands) and then to tap every available source for settlers.

Some understanding of the motives which impel an American-born Jewish youth to leave this country for a life in Eretz Yisrael is needed, if we are to bring about an effective *halutz* movement. There is no doubt that a sense of insecur- ity or a feeling of not being accepted will impel a person to embark on a search for a real home. Most American Jews have no such feelings and therefore look upon any American anti-Semitism as temporary. Other Jews choose to live in Eretz Yisrael because they want complete Jewish lives. Their self-fulfilment is de- nied them unless they can live in a He- braic environment with all that it im- plies. There is a third group of well- adjusted American Jewish youth who see the needs of Jewish life and who are in- spired by the idealism of a nation reborn. They want a part in the work and there- fore elect to become *halutzim.*

There are two bases (aside from the relatively unimportant factors of economic opportunity, marriage, etc.) for a strong American *halutziut*. One is the fear of anti-Semitism; the other is the love of Judaism and the Jewish people. Zionists ought to be in the forefront of the struggle against anti-Semitism. Some Zionists do the cause of Zionism a distinct disservice by dogmatically asserting that anti-Semitism cannot be avoided and therefore Jews should depart for Palestine. Anti-Semitism may triumph in the United States; it may even take a violent form. But American Zionists have a patriotic duty (in the highest sense) to fight it here, because it is the enemy of democracy and humanity. If it should come to pass, however, that American anti-Semitism would approach the stage reached in Germany, there would be no need for a call for *halutziut*. Jews would flock to Palestine.

Jews have a habit of living on hope and faith in human perfectability. When, as a people, we lose these characteristics, we cease being true to our tradition. We dare not, therefore, turn now to American Jews with the cry, "Watch out! anti-Semitism is on the march! Get out before it is too late! Join *Hechalutz* and go to Palestine for security!" Not only would such a call fail. It would be false to the ideals of freedom and equality which the Jewish people share with all other democrats of the world.

Our only alternative, if we want *halutzim*, is to build a strong, pulsating American Jewish life. The surest way to discourage *halutziut* is to preach a defeatist attitude toward American Judaism. By telling Jews that Jewish life here is of no value, that it has no future, we inevitably weaken American Judaism. The weakening process will not lead to a strong *halutz* movement. It is much more likely to result in an increased assimilation. For most American Jews, an Americanism without Judaism is the alternative to a strong American Judaism. This is the only conclusion to be derived from an analysis of American Jewish history to date. Zionists delude themselves if they imagine that the alternative will be a strong *halutz* movement.

Picture, however, the effect of a vital American Jewish life on *halutziut*. In the free atmosphere of a multi-cultured America, the Jew will experience Judaism as a secondary culture, which, because of its broad scope, will play an important part in shaping his personality. Within a communtiy of a few million Jews who live as intense a Jewish life as possible on the American scene, there seems little doubt that a good number of young people will want to go the limit. Their Judaism will mean so much in their lives, that they will want a complete expression of it in Eretz Yisrael. These will form the nucleus of a *halutz* movement and their influence may serve to arouse a similar desire among other Jews.

Our point of view is one that assumes the possibility of perpetuating Jewish life in the diaspora. But even Jacob Klatzkin, one of the foremost theoreticians of the *shelilat hagalut* philosophy, pleads for an intensive effort on the part of diaspora Jewry to hold the fort. He indicates that before the final achievement of a Jewish Palestine, there is a need to preserve all the Jews we can for ultimate *aliyah*. Eventually, with the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, diaspora communities will disappear. Without accepting Klatzkin's dismal prognosis for the ultimate denouement of American Jewry, one must agree with what is implicit in his remarks, namely, that at least for the present *halutziut* needs a healthy American Judaism for its success.

dening the Concept of Halutziut

Recently, the Yishuv has begun to take interest in the American Jewish scene, art from the usual appeal for financial l political support. It is beginning to concerned with the vitality of diaspora wry. Examples of this interest are the merous *shelihim* sent by Palestinian ups, the call for an international con- ence of Jewish educators, and the pre- ration of educational materials speci- ally for diaspora use. Zionists must un- rstand the reality behind this sudden akening of the Yishuv. The Yishuv is *ginning* to accept as the desideratum of onism, the survival of the Jewish peo- not only in Palestine, but throughout world, wherever Jews live. They are ginning to realize that there are some llions of Jews outside Palestine who nt to continue to live as Jews and who ust be helped to do so, even if they have desire to end their days in Eretz srael. Zionism, with this objective, be- mes not a one-way movement in the rection of Palestine, but a cooperative ort of all Jewries to strengthen the meland and the diaspora communities. ith this as an objective, there is clearly dire need for the spirit of *halutziut* thin and for American Judaism.

Halutziut must be viewed not only as effort to influence Jews to emigrate to lestine, there to devote themselves to e cause of the Jewish people. This is doubtdly one of the crying needs of wish life today. But it is not the only gitimate expression of the *halutz* spirit. nyone at all familiar with the problems the average American rabbi, Jewish ducator, Hebrew teacher, or community orker knows at what a tremendous per- nal sacrifice these Jewish professionals, they are sincere, pursue their careers. o restore content to Jewish communal fe in America is a task which tests the ingenuity, patience, and devotion of any man. It is an enormous educational task. Frequently, it involves isolating oneself in a small community and working in a cultural vacuum. The Jewish professional worker gives much but receives very little spiritual nourishment for himself. Nevertheless, despite or perhaps because of these and other difficulties, the job of serving the American Jewish community is a necessary one.

We need a spirit of *halutziut* among American Jewish youth with respect to American Jewish life as well as with respect to Palestine. Too many of our rabbis, Hebrew teachers, social workers, etc., enter their professions with an improper understanding of the needs of American Jewry. Too often they approach their work from the standpoint of enhancing their personal prestige or income. Not that there is anything inherently wrong with the desire for personal advancement. But if Jewish life is to survive in the United States, we must have a strong nucleus of *halutzim*—missionaries, if you will—who will devote their lives to the cause of their people on American soil.

There is yet another type of *halutziut* which must be evoked as soon as possible. Throughout the world there are Jewish communities starving for Jewish leadership. Europe and South America are the key points in this regard. They must be serviced, but the proper manpower is, as yet, unavailable. All types of communal workers are required to give direction to these Jewishly barren communities. The mobilizing of Jews who would be willing to devote a few years of their lives to such tasks is a needed form of *halutziut*. Many Jews who in general favor *halutziut* (in the Palestine-centered sense) oppose the movement for American Jews on the ground that it would remove the best leadership from the American Jewish

scene. This argument, while understandable, is hardly valid. At the present time, those individuals who leave for Palestine do so for one of the two reasons cited above, a sense of insecurity or a desire to live a more complete Jewish life than is possible here in America. Now it is obvious that a strengthened Palestine will help to vitalize American Jewish life and thereby produce a greater participation on the part of Jews who would otherwise be uninterested in Jewish affairs. The source of leadership will therefore be increased, and while a considerably larger number of individuals may turn to Palestinian *halutziut* as an expression of their Jewish yearnings, it is equally certain that formerly untouched sources of American communal leadership will be tapped.

The Road to Halutziut

From all that has been said there are two important practical conclusions to be drawn. First, there is a dire need for an appeal to the idealism of American Jewish youth for their contribution to the survival of the Jewish people. They must be appealed to on the basis of the universalist implications of Zionism, and the role which it can play in bringing about a more exalted conception of nationalism. An appeal of this type must be launched, not in the name of the Zionist movement alone, but on behalf of the Jewish people. It must be a joint effort of those agencies in Jewish life which bear the brunt of the work in shaping our future as a people. The Joint Distribution Committee, the Zionist organizations, Jewish educational institutions—these and other groups must act together to awaken American Jewish youth to an understanding not only of the plight of their people, but also of the personal self-fulfilment to be derived from serving it. There are many ways for an individual to serve mankind. It is time that Jews look with respect on those who serve humanity by laboring for the cause of Israel.

Secondly, Zionists must develop a sounder educational approach to the Jewish public. Political propaganda has its place, but it cannot serve to insure the participation of the next generation of Jews in Zionism. Similiarly, the drive to secure settlers for Palestine serves an important function, but concentration on this project alone will not produce a large number of *halutzim*. On the contrary, it will alienate from Zionism many who might have been able to serve the movement if they had been properly prepared. Briefly, what American Zionism needs most is a wholehearted concern by Zionists in the strengthening of Jewish educational institutions, and in the democratization of Jewish communal life. Only in this way can the future of the movement be insured. And only in this way can we hope to create a *halutz spirit* among American Jews.

We have heard much from Zionist leaders, of their determination to bring the cause of Zionism to every nook and cranny of the American Jewish community. Unfortunately, unless they take advantage of the Jewish schools, the synagogues, the Jewish centers and the other already existing educational media available to them, their efforts will meet with little success. Zionists will have to learn that the Zionist organizations are not the only ways in which Jews affiliate themselves with the Jewish community, and that to reach Jews they must see Jewish life as a whole. Zionism (*halutziut* included) will be successful to the degree that it provides both a rationale and inspiration for an *American* Jewish life.

This, Our Last Stand*

A Reply to Rabbis Eisenstein and Agus

By ABRAHAM G. DUKER

IN this rejoinder to the critiques by Rabbi Ira Eisenstein and Jacob B. Agus of my article, "The War to Annihilate the Jews—The Second Phase" (THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST, November 1, 1946), I shall first restate briefly my thesis, to wit, that present British policy in Palestine must inevitably lead (1) to the annihilation of the Yishuv through the setting up, under the ex-Mufti's leadership, of an Arab-dominated state; (2) to the extermination of the Jews now in the DP camps of Germany and Austria and of those in some European and Arab countries whence they must get out immediately in order to survive; and finally, (3) to a violent British propaganda against the Jews in the free countries, who will be Britain's enemy No. 1, because the British would utilize anti-Semitism as a weapon, in their anti-Soviet campaign, thus placing Jewish lives everywhere in the gravest kind of danger.

Rabbi Eisenstein denied the possibility of the materialization of my predictions. Rabbi Agus, on the contrary, generally agreed with my thesis. He recommended war against Jewish "terrorism" and yielding to Britain as the method of preventing the British from conducting a world-wide anti-Jewish campaign. I shall therefore spare the reader detailed explanations of my arguments. Instead, I will concentrate on the so-called fallacies in my paper, as viewed by the two rabbis.

What I Did Not Say

First, a paragraph or two on what I did *not* say.

I did *not*, as Rabbi Eisenstein claims, make the "error of assuming that the British are essentially Nazis." I did *not* "imagine" that Liverpool and Glasgow are "already" in flames. I did *not* say that "the British propagandists are *now* consulting *Mein Kampf* to use it as 'their Bible'." Nor did I state, as Rabbi Agus would have it, that the present war against Zionism is "a conspiracy which was deliberately conceived to be a crusade against world Jewry." I shall not bother requoting what I actually stated. The perusal of even the brief summary of my thesis above will convince the reader that both Rabbis Eisenstein and Agus, in their ardor, no doubt, did not bother to check my actual text, and that they have read into it, words and thoughts, which I did *not* put on paper.

True, the English are not basically Nazis. Neither were most of the Germans when Hitler began his campaign of conquest of Germany and later of the world, using anti-Semitism as his major weapon. But this is beside the point. Can we afford the luxury of identifying anti-Jewish strategy only with Nazism? There were anti-Semites before the Nazis came into existence. There will be anti-Semites even after the Nazis will go out of existence. The likelihood of a complete disappearance of Nazism is highly debatable, in view of the pampering of the Germans, particularly by the Western Allies. What I was trying to convey in my article was

* The views expressed in this article and in the previous article which it defends, are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Editorial Board. The same is true of the opposing views in the critiques of Dr. Eisenstein and Dr. Agus. We submit to the readers both sides of the discussion in the belief that a presentation of the problem from both viewpoints should help toward the adoption of a sound policy.—*Editors.*

the possible and even probable use of anti-Semitism as a weapon against Jews, and its tie-up with an anti-Soviet crusade. Rabbi Agus seems to agree with me on this. We shall, therefore, drop his particular argument.

How to Identify an Anti-Semite

Of course, identifying the anti-Semite is a major problem. Both my opponents maintain that Bevin is not an anti-Semite. By this time, every sensitive Jew (and I do not mean necessarily the alarmist type) should be able to detect the symptoms of anti-Semitism without being trained in psychoanalysis. He should recognize that public references to Jews as always desiring to get to the head of the queue, and as being unwanted in New York are indications of unfriendliness towards Jews, a phenomenon which I, for one, would call anti-Semitism. The reader will have to take my word for it (Rabbis Eisenstein and Agus and the editors were told the name and place) that a major leader of the Labor Party, an inside man, characterized Bevin as an anti-Semite. Another leader in the Labor Party, I am reliably informed, stated upon reading my article that my analysis was essentially correct and that so was my identification of Bevin as an anti-Semite. Rabbi Agus tries to exonerate Bevin, the misjudged, "who warned against the rise of anti-Semitism in the British army and was grossly insulted for his pains." That is no joke, Rabbi Agus. Moreover there is also quite a bit of talk that Attlee and Morrison are worse than Bevin. And so they are, to judge by their policies.

If the British Labor Party is friendly to Jews, as Rabbi Agus maintains, where are the signs of friendship, at least outside of Palestine? Are the British showing any desire to punish the killers of the Jews? Was the defender of the SS who called the Jewish victims "dregs of the Ghetto" discharged? Just what is the situation of the Jewish DP's in the British zone of occupation? What did the Labor government do about the pogromists in Tripoli? What is it doing about the support of the pogromist Polish fascists, whose underground representatives in Poland are out to liquidate the remnants of Israel? Some friendship, Rabbi Agus!

To prove a minimum of friendship, all that the British would have had to do is slyly and understandingly to shut one eye to the "illegal" immigration. But they prefer to throw depth bombs to discourage the swimmers and shoot Jewish refugees. If Rabbis Eisenstein and Agus prefer to identify people as anti-Semites only after they have done their killing or only if they rant their mouths off after the manner of Rankin and Bilbo, it is their privilege to err. But whether Jewish leadership can afford to underestimate anti-Semitism after the Auschwitz training school is another matter. Whether anti-Semites can ever be appeased is most doubtful.

Hitler's Passive Partners

This inability to interpret the facts of Jewish life in the post-Auschwitz era is seen most clearly in the resentment of both critics against my accusation of Britain's share in the responsibility for the annihilation of European Jewry. Rabbi Eisenstein implies that I had convinced myself about it and accentuates that idea as if it were something preposterous. Rabbi Agus is a bit more realistic. While claiming that the accusation is grossly unfair, he admits that America may also be blamed if England is, as well as those who "did not give their last penny to the Zionist cause in the twenties and thirties." I do not agree on the justice of the third point, although something may be said in its favor. I do insist on the second point, America's guilt.

Let us give a brief resumé of the Roosevelt Administration's efforts for "saving" the Jews. It is characterized by its consistent support of the White Paper policy; the Evian and Bermuda conferences; the failure to use United States immigration quotas; the sponsorship of the Intergovernmental Refugee Committee, which well served Hitler's purpose; the "finagling" with Mussolini about settling Jews in Ethiopia (read the Ciano Diaries); the resistance to the rescue proposals of responsible Jewish organizations during the war; and finally, the magnificent pre-election fraud of the War Refugee Board, not to speak of the Ibn Saud correspondence. This resumé should convince all but those who want not to be convinced come what may, that America was guilty.

Some day when documents will be published by competent historians (that is, when Jewish leadership will be sufficiently mature to finance such research), the knowledge of the deliberate non-interference with the murder of the Jews will become the property of the public instead of the few students and diplomats (e.g., Bartley Crum), who have had access to the documents and facts and are not as yet in a position to make their knowledge public. Investigation of the role played by some "prominent" American Jews in helping the Roosevelt Administration to pursue the course of refusing to rescue Jews would also provide some nice exercise for a historian with very strong nerves.

The British Next in Guilt to the Nazis

But there are degrees of guilt. Of course, the Nazis and their direct collaborationists are first on the list. Next are those who could have helped and did not. In this category the British occupy the first place. First, it was they only who held the key to Palestine to which they admitted during the war, Greeks, Yugoslavs and pogromist Poles—but not Jews. Second, it was the British war-time government that stymied every effort at rescue. Even cautious Ira A. Hirschmann does not mince any words about it in his *Life Line to a Promised Land*. Of course, he ignores the F. D. R. aspect. This is understandable. But one would expect rabbinical leadership to take more of an interest in contemporary Jewish history. The facts are available for the asking.

Dr. Jacob Robinson of the Institute of Jewish Affairs will tell at least part of the story. So will Dr. Irving Dwork, formerly of the O.S.S., and Dr. Isaac Stone, the specialist on Documents of Nuremberg Trials. So will I. World Jewish Congress reports also contain plenty of material. Why not read them before accusing the present writer of hysteria and distortion? And why not establish a Jewish research body for investigating this problem?

We should like the reader to visualize the British reaction had there been, let us say, three million more Jews left alive in Europe, most of them clamoring to enter Palestine. Is it conceivable that British leadership can be very remorseful about the murder of the six million, in view of its present attitude towards the pitiful survivors and the murderers of the survivors' kin? We wonder!

Once the British are exonerated from any share of guilt in the annihilation of the six million Jews, it is easy to view every little twist in British policy as a sign of change of mind and fairness. In this class are Rabbi Eisenstein's conclusions from the dismissal of General Barker, presumably on account of his anti-Semitic racist order. General Barker is back in Palestine. Moreover, Lt. Col. Richard Webb, who spoke to the press in such a refreshing manner about the "de-

spicable race," and admitted cheerfully, "you know the boys use sometimes the butts of their rifles and do a spot of looting," it was revealed, was transferred not because of anti-Semitism, *rahmana litzlan,* but because of his unkind remarks about the Soviet Union. I need not tell here about the phony assassination scares in Paris, London, and now in Basle in connection with the Zionist World Congress. Nor do I have to go into details as to anti-Semitic propaganda in England, drummed up by the pro-government press to such magnitude as to cause the Jewish community to call a special conference to consider it. Of course, the propaganda is against "Zionists." The headlines, however, are not as discriminating as those in the New York *Times,* which draws the line between "Zionists" and "Jews." The British press is willing to give the "Jews" *all* the credit for "terror," real or imaginary. Their government knows it and encourages it. I presume that both my critics read the daily press. I shall therefore save time, ink and paper, by desisting from listing incidents of studied anti-Semitism by civilians and military in Palestine and in Great Britain.

Types of Liquidation

The intention of the British to liquidate the Yishuv is denied by both critics. I wonder, in particular, where Rabbi Agus gets his assurance that "Britain does not intend to liquidate the Yishuv." Is not the White Paper the *vade mecum* of Britain's Palestine policy? Does not the White Paper provide for setting up an independent Palestine state? Does it not leave control of immigration to the good will of the Arabs? Will not an "independent Palestine state" be ruled by the followers of the ex-Mufti? Does Rabbi Agus need more evidence as to Haj Amin al Husseini's intentions concerning the Jews in view of that war criminal's own statement before the Inquiry Commission of 1937 and in the light of the evidence of the Nazi records, still to be published by our State Department? Did not the Palestine Arab Committee assert that "independent" Palestine would consider as its nationals only Jews settled there before 1919 and their descendants? What will it do to the rest of the Yishuv? Did not the British make it possible for the pogromist ex-Mufti to return to the Middle East? Are not his henchmen the pampered children of the Palestine Administration? Are not Arabs everywhere armed by the British and American lend lease? Are they not organized in military formations in Palestine? Did not Glubb Pasha outline the scheme of the Arab "revolt" should the Jews win any points? What kind of a world does Rabbi Agus think he is living in, anyway, or can't he read facts without bringing in *Midrashic* interpretations?

They Don't Want War

While Rabbi Eisenstein adheres to the school of *"lo dubim vlo yaar"* ("No bears, and no woods"), Rabbi Agus has a remedy to offer. He is correct in stating that the British do not want a war against the Jews. Neither did the Nazis want resistance in the Warsaw ghetto, according to Gen. von Stroop's day-by-day battle reports. They preferred to have the Jews permit themselves to be driven to the boxcars without resistance. Indeed, the British would love it if the Jews consented to their scheme of turning Palestine over to the Arabs, and then allowed themselves to be exterminated or at best, to be driven out by the pro-Mufti leaders, who will rule the Palestine Arab Republic. But they know that the Jews will not permit such treatment. Tirades against the Irgun and the Sternites will not be of help in the situation. Moderate Agency leaders have tasted concentration camp life and

Haganah centers have been dis-d. The Haganah does have weapons, no one knows when its very cautious reasonable leaders may issue the last order for armed resistance. It is easy lame Jewish "extremism" for a war ched by British official terrorism. It ld have been proper to say a word wo also about the British extremists. r all, it is the British who are pushing Jews to armed resistance. I assure bi Agus that I would not like to see petition of the Masada or the Sika-m incidents. But his suggested remedy ely amounts to an introduction to ropriation and mass slaughter of the s in Palestine after they will have n made defenseless, and in Europe r all avenues of escape will have been sed.

Rabbi Agus accuses me of "conjuring the image of a million Jews doomed die, if the gates of Palestine are not ened." Alas, that picture is not a pro-ct of my imagination. At the last UJA nference, Mr. Edward M. M. Warburg orted the presence of 250,000 Jewish P's in Germany, Austria and Italy. We ought until then that the maximum mber was 175,000. At the same con-rence, Dr. Frederic Georoeg reported at 180,000 Hungarian Jews were in a d plight. Does Rabbi Agus think that umania, which has been desisting from ecuting people of the type that in-gnantly denied at war crimes trials eir responsibility for the murder of ,000 Jews, insisting that they had man-ged the killing of only 16,000, will make possible for the Jews to adjust them-lves to conditions and to survive in umania? I shudder to think of the com-ng Passover in view of the arduous reparations for blood libels by "Chris-ian" circles. There is a likelihood of an utpouring of Jews in the Spring into the P camps of such magnitude that the Polish post-Kielce exodus was a Sunday school excursion in comparison. Is Rabbi Agus so convinced that the Slovak Jews are safe? And what about the Jews in the Arab Near East? And is not anti-Semitism a danger in other continents? And should Jews not have the right to their homeland even if there is no threat of anti-Semitism? What about the right of Jews to survive as Jews and not merely as human beings? Does he realize the extent of post-war conversion and assimilation that has been undermining Jewish life, particularly in Western Europe? Does he really think that the puny communities in Europe will be able to carry on an effective Jewish life? Do we not need Palestine for cultural and religious survival? Re-read Ruppin, Rabbi Agus!

Rabbi Agus also dismisses my premise that a prosperous and democratic Near East will favor the Zionist cause. Prosperous and educated Arabs will be more nationalistic, he maintains. That is possible, depending on the trend. I do maintain, however, that the decrease in poverty will lead to a lesser likelihood of robbery motives, a determining factor in anti-Jewish attacks, as proven in Europe and as seen in Arab hints at appropriation of Jewish property. Irrigation of large stretches of land in Arab countries might also help to transfer large numbers of poorer Arabs from Jewish districts of Palestine. Besides, I do not believe in the eternity of exaggerated nationalism. But I do believe that if the Jewish people will not be saved very soon, they may lose their battle for existence forever. Prosperous and educated Jewish and Arab democratic communities are more likely to federate and unite than the ignorant and poverty stricken leaders of today, dominated by the ex-Mufti and educated by St. John Philby and Freya Stark.

A Few Thoughts About Resistance

It is all too simple to say that Pales-

tine cannot immediately take care of a million immigrants in order to argue against the Zionist solution, which is exactly what Rabbi Agus is doing under his peacemaker's disguise. We haven't heard as yet of other places open to masses of Jews. To assume that the tactical British admission to Palestine of 1,500 Jews monthly is proof that the British do not intend to liquidate the Yishuv, is to fall for the error that those who wish to annihilate the Jews must follow the exact pattern of the Nazi experiment. Annihilation can be achieved by flooding the country with Arabs, who do not need entry certificates, by reducing the Jews to impotence and then letting the Arabs have their way, which is exactly what the British will do if we let them. And the major reason why the British have not had their way completely, is Jewish resistance. Of course, there is no guarantee that resistance will produce proper results. But Rabbi Agus's way is a sure road to defeat.

I maintain that British policy can be reversed. This may require a Jewish compromise which has a basis for acceptance even by people who labor under the notion that compromise is the right thing. A viable Jewish state is a feasible compromise. To obtain even this viable state, the Jews must use persuasion of all types. Immigration must be continued under any conditions, to prevent the continued deterioration of the Jews in the DP camps, to introduce more Jews into Palestine and to demonstrate before the world British brutality and Jewish poverty, as well as the Jewish right to Palestine. There is a tendency to forget about the Jews in the DP camps and to minimize European anti-Semitism. This must not be permitted. There is also on record persuasion by the force of weapons, which has brought to a successful conclusion the struggle for national liberation of many nationalities. There is no guarantee that it will succeed in the case of the Jews. Still it is preferable to Rabbi Agus' meek solution of a lamb permitting himself to be led to slaughter.

To declare that Jews should not seek recourse to arms becaues of ethical considerations is to close Palestine forever to Jewish immigration. Nothing better can be expected unless one believes in Messianic calculations. Armed resistance should be viewed from the practical point of view of its use as a political weapon, of course not as the only weapon. Its ethical angle is to be considered, in our particular situation, in the light of the adage, *"Haba lehargekha hashkem vehargo,"*—"If one is out to murder you, kill him first!" For this is exactly the position of the Jews versus the British who commit hostilities against the Yishuv. And this is what may be the position of the Jews versus the entire "civilized world," if the British succeed in persuading the other powers to use similar coercive measures. A Jewish minority in Palestine spells extermination of the Jews. I need not enlarge on its consequence in terms of effects on Jews everywhere else. The only way to prevent the Jewish people from becoming the outlaw among the nations, is to effect a change in British policy.

From the point of view of public relations it is disastrous to decry armed resistance as a means of achieving our purpose. The "moderates" of today are likely to be the "terrorists" of tomorrow. The "terrorists" of today may be wrong in their timing of the resistance. They may be condemned for their foolhardiness or lack of political calculations, of attacking the wrong party at the wrong time. But let us not try to turn the Jewish people into a nation of abstract saints—

unwanted article in Western civiliza-
. To do this would be to desecrate the
nories of the Ghetto fighters and to
up our existence. The parallel is
too obvious in terms of the struggle
nst the annihilation of the Jews.
The timing of the armed action, I, for
, am willing to leave to the Haganah,
be used only as a last resort; I hope
t it will not be required. The recent
osition within the Labor Party shows
t there is some hope. The very fact
t the British back down occasionally
proof of their hesitation. America can
l must play an important role in this
ocess of the British change of mind.
fact, the United States, I maintain,
able to force the British to change their
licy. To do this, there must be a con-
ntration of public pressure and diplo-
acy in keeping with the task of last
tch defense of the Jewish people every-
nere. Such a task is beyond the strength
d capacity of the Zionists alone. For
is reason, I advocated that our defense
ganizations get together on this problem.
or this reason I wrote the article, which
deliberately termed "A Memorandum to
ewish Leaders." Judging by my critics,
ewish leaders need a few courses in con-
emporary Jewish affairs. They also need
ome shock therapy to make them think
n post-Auschwitz rather than in 19th
entury "goody-goody" terms. Alas! the
lot against the Jews is not to be con-
ured away by good will sermons and
njunctions against the use of self-defense,
misnamed "terrorism" by Jews to the de-
ight of those British who are preparing
o force the Haganah into submission or
'terrorism."

Finally, an answer to those who would solve problems by conjuring them away through the use of quotations. Rabbi Eisenstein applies the old adage *Al tiftah peh la-satan* (Do not give Satan an occasion to accuse), while Rabbi Agus calls for prophets to issue the call "to go and cause Israel to rest." Rabbi Eisenstein is under the impression that the British diplomats and politicians do not know all the tricks of the trade and that bringing the known facts of anti-Semitism and its dangers before the public, might cause them to be intensified. I have nothing to say to this. As for Rabbi Agus' advice, I ask: how is it possible for Israel to rest in the sight of its six million dead, of its hundreds of thousands homeless, of hundreds of thousands more in danger of their lives; in face of rising anti-Semitism everywhere, of the danger of the imminent destruction of the only integral community left in the world, the fully Jewish community of Palestine, almost 700,000 strong, the epitome of our hopes for survival, the only community in the world which fights for the privilege of sheltering the dispossessed Jews? How can Israel rest in the face of betrayal, past and present, in the face of the very danger to its life, in the face of provocation? If we were to follow Rabbi Agus's soporific solution, Israel, to paraphrase Lord Byron, would find its rest only in the grave. This is what Zionism does not intend to let come to pass. And this is why Jews neither here nor in Palestine will heed Rabbi Agus' liquidationist advice of yielding to men of ill will without struggle, of allowing ourselves to be dumped into the Mediterranean without resistance, and of letting Hitler's heirs get away with their extermination plans without fighting back.

Random Thoughts

JEWISH religion without the Jewish people is like a skylight without a house.

The Jewish people without Jewish religion is like a house without windows.

The traditionalists prefer stained-glass windows; the reconstructionists want the windows to be transparent.

* * *

It is as impossible to be spiritually literate without being economically and socially literate as to know algebra without knowing arithmetic.

* * *

The immaturity of any culture betrays itself in what that culture does with its folk religion. By that test American culture has not yet come of age.

For example, on Thanksgiving Day a well-known department store stages a parade with pink elephants and ice cream cones that tower to the skies. That parade empties all the churches and synagogues of their would-be worshipers.

The business exploitation of infantile interests and tastes, which enables such a parade to steal a march on the historic religions, sooner or later marches men off to the wars.

* * *

Men's vanity makes their wives parasitic; women's envy makes their husbands avaricious.

* * *

Though idolatry is out of fashion, it has many substitutes.

The respect we show a flag is a form of idolatry, though a legitimate one.

Zangwill charged the Jews with Torah-latry, because they treat the scroll of the Torah as though it were an image. Those who treat it in that way, without having any idea of its contents are, in fact, idolators.

People who reverentially drink in words that convey no meaning are logolaters, word-worshipers.

Such was the lady who would go into a trance at the mere sound of "Mesopotamia."

Such is Gerald Heard, a Hollywood disciple of Hinduism who, in recommending a book by one Hindu mystic about another, writes, "When I read Brahmanvanda, I don't remember a word he says, but feel some time after that finding God is obviously the only concern for human life."

Word worship reached its climax in Neo-Platonism, and in the phase of Kabbalah which fell under its influence, when God came to mean virtually the deification of "Nothing."

* * *

King Solomon did not become a cynic until he was old. It was then that he wrote the book of Ecclesiastes.

Nowadays children begin making cynical wise-cracks before they are out of kindergarten.

* * *

To aspire to the heights of reason and spirit is human destiny. Their call is like "the call of the earth's high places."

This is why to be truly human is so much like mountain climbing.

"A man climbs," writes a famous mountain-climber, "because that is the way he is made."

Does that mean, then, that everybody goes adventuring? Not at all.

"There are still and always will be more people who would rather ride than

ks, and rather walk than climb," says
: same writer.

Yet we question his Calvinistic doc-
e of the elect, when he adds: "It is
hopeless to try to convey the magic of
untains to a non-climber as it would
say, to explain music to the deaf."

We prefer to share his hope that moun-
neering will be taken out of the hands
the specialized few and brought "to
: realm of general employment, where
belongs."

* * *

The classical Reformist reconstruction
Judaism resembles Mark Twain's sug-
sted reconstruction of a Dinosaur:
Three bones and a dozen barrels of plas-
r."

* * *

Lofty sentiments that are not translated
to concrete action have all the fascina-
on of soap bubbles.

* * *

Rational faith is two-thirds responsi-
ility and one-third reason.

Irrational faith is all responsibility and
o reason.

Sophistication is one-third reason and
wo-thirds irresponsibility.

The sophisticate who grows tired of his
rresponsibility naturally reverts to irra-
ional faith, because he does not want to
ncounter any reminder of his original
elf.

* * *

Even a clock, which has stopped, regis-
ters correct time twice a day. This is why
even Orthodoxy can't be always wrong.

* * *

He who hopes, by giving charity, to
make amends for violation of justice is
like an assassin who expects to go free,
because he paid the funeral expenses of
his victim.

* * *

The English historian George Trevelyan informs us that Queen Elizabeth was the first English sovereign to transfer the relief of the poor from a municipal to a national basis.

By 1680 one-fifth of the entire English nation was "in occasional receipt of alms."

This is about the proportion of our own Jewish people that now depends on relief. In meeting our responsibility on the U.J.A. scale, we are only doing what any decent people has a right to expect its members to do. Being a Jew today is in that respect no harder than being an Englishman in 1680.

* * *

To be contemporary does not necessarily mean being temporary.

* * *

Psychologists inform us that the first years of a person's life determine his character and happiness for the rest of his days. No wonder the three fates, or Parcae of classic literature, look like nurse-maids.

* * *

The slogan, "Human rights are above property rights," is generally hurled by politicians as though it were a verbal bomb to blow up monopolistic interest. On examination it turns out to be a mere dud.

Why?

Because any right whatever is a human right, property rights included.

And because no human right means anything unless it is convertible into some kind of property right.

To make sense, that slogan would have to be translated into saying that the natural or divine right of every human being to own enough property to retain his freedom and security is higher than any man-made right which merely secures the actual owners in what they already possess.

But what practical politician can afford to say that? M. M. K.

Book Notes

MAKING THE BIBLE LESS FORMIDABLE

PATHWAYS THROUGH THE BIBLE, by Mortimer J. Cohen, illustrations by Arthur Szyk, Jewish Publication Society of America, Phila., Pa., 1946, *pp.* 548.

PATHWAYS Through the Bible is a book that should be found in every English-speaking Jewish home. We predict that, wherever it will have a place on a Jewish book-shelf, it will not remain on the shelf but will be taken down and read. The Bible has been so overloaded with learned commentary, so subjected to higher-critical, lower-critical and uncritical analysis, so obscured by translation into an English only a little less foreign to most readers than the original Hebrew, so pedantically edited to preserve all the mistakes of earlier scholars, that it has become a sort of mystic shrine which the uninitiated fear to enter. The present volume, as its title implies, cuts pathways through the Bible, and gives the general reader a chance to survey all its rich contents and to feel again the perennial freshness and cogency of its message. It helps him to establish contact with the great personalities portrayed in the Bible, to commune with the lawgivers, prophets, psalmists, poets and thinkers among its authors and heroes. It enables the reader to re-live the thrilling and tragic events in which Judaism was born and so get an insight into the spirit of Jewish civilization and of that religious outlook on life which has been an inspiration to the whole Western and a good part of the Eastern world.

The author's method is simple. He has selected from all the books of the Bible the edifying and interesting passages, omitting genealogies and other matters of interest only to scholars. He has translated the text into a readable modern English, though he retains familiar archaisms in the Book of Psalms. He has added brief and simple introductions to the Biblical books, and provided sub-titles indicating the contents of each passage. Often he rearranges the Biblical passages in the interest of coherence and unity. He does not hesitate, for instance, to group laws of Leviticus and of Deuteronomy together where they deal with the same subject material. (The sources, however, are clearly indicated so that the student is not misled by the rearrangement.) He similarly interpolates passages from Ruth in Judges, Chronicles in Samuel, etc. The effect of these devices is amazing. It is to impress us not only with the rich variety of Biblical literature, but also with the essential spiritual unity of the Bible. For the central theme of the Bible stands out clearly—Israel's ancient quest for God, the desire to find meaning and purpose in life and to bring life into harmony with as much as has been revealed of the divine law on which human salvation depends.

The illustrations by Arthur Szyk are interesting and indeed fascinating. They are done in the author's characteristic style, which is highly decorative, elaborate in detail and symbolical in spirit. This has definite advantages for the illustration of the Bible. An attempt to be realistic tends to divert from the essential meaning of the text, which always transcends its local setting in time and place. We have seen Bible illustrations

, while very faithful to details of color in landscape, clothing, architre, etc., make all the characters apremote and bizarre, although the ng of the Bible makes us feel a deep lip with its characters in their prob- and their strivings. Szyk makes no npt at that sort of realism. The es his characters wear are all of , such as nobody ever wore. They embroidered with elaborate designs, e of poor Naomi and Ruth, no less those of King Solomon. This is derate. There is no need to be troubled ut anachronism. For the clothes are levant except as they can be used for orative purposes. But the portraits hfully express the essential mood and a which the artist wishes to convey.

Moreover, though there is deliberate nventionalization of design on the part the artist he avoids the usual artistic hes in Bible illustration. There are, for mple, no winged angels; the being o wrestles with Jacob is in human form the Biblical author conceived him. rthermore, although the artist is interced in the universal message of the Bibal episodes rather than in a realistic construction of the Biblical scene, he oes not make his characters lose their ewishness in this process of universaliza- on. The personalities depicted are typially Jewish. To the artist, the Jewish ype of physiognomy is as human as any ther type and he sees no reason for conealing the fact that the Bible is Jewish terature in order to stress the univerality of its appeal. Of course, there will e differences of opinion as to the artist's nterpretation of his characters. His Job, or example, strikes me as too piously neek to express the passionate protest in Job's arguments not only with his friends ut with God Himself. Nevertheless, the llustrations undeniably add interest to the book; they also cut a pathway to an appreciation of the Bible.

EUGENE KOHN

BOOKS RECEIVED

A LAYMAN LOOKS AT THE BIBLE, by C. A. Ben Mordecai, with an Introduction by Abraham I. Katsh and a Memoir by Solomon E. Starrels. Essays in interpretation of various passages in the Biblical books. 137 pp., the Hoboken Book Press, New York, 1946.

BENEATH THE SURFACE, by Maxwell Berger, an attempt to reconcile the traditional text of the Pentateuch with modern science. 169 pp., Bloch Publishing Co., New York, 1946.

FAITH THROUGH REASON, a Modern Interpretation of Judaism by Charles Schwartz and Bertie G. Schwartz, an affirmation and exposition of the religious convictions of the authors. 189 pp., The Macmillan Co., New York, 1946.

ALL GOD'S CHILDREN, a Jew Speaks, by Armond E. Cohen, an attempt to explain modern Jews and their Judaism for the Christian world. 104 pp., The Macmillan Co., New York, 1945.

REALITIES AND VAULES

(*Continued from Page* 9)

or place of amusement frequented by Whites. It is a good sign that the practice of segregation offends the religious sensibilities of so many church women.

▼

RABBI JUDAH L. FISHMAN, who represents Mizrachi on the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, is reported in a JTA dispatch from Basle to have announced that he would not participate in an executive or in a triumvirate together with "a Reform rabbi who is preaching on Sundays." If Rabbi Fishman is so intolerant that he cannot collaborate in the cause of Zion with a Reform rabbi on a basis of mutual respect for religious differences, he disqualifies himself for any position of leadership in the Zionist movement. Particularly now that we aspire to statehood in Eretz Yisrael is such religious bigotry a menace to our cause.

CORRESPONDENCE

Sees a Contradiction in The Reconstructionist's Attitude to Great Britain

Sirs:

I find in your November 1st issue such a startling contradiction in items on separate pages that I am wondering which one represents the policy of your staff. In your opening editorial you hew to the "reasonable" line. You write: "The American Zionists have shot their bolt. They have hinted darkly of election day . . . and President Truman has taken the hint." You conclude "it is no longer a question of refugees, or of political pressure at the polls; it is a question of how England can be shown that her survival is compatible with Palestine's revival, with the revival of the entire Middle East." You suggest that "excessive partisanship" must be curbed and that vision and consecration should be brought forth.

This seems to the reader mild, statesmanlike and reasonable.

Two pages beyond the editorial comment we come to the section entitled "Realities and Values." Here, the mood has changed, radically. The writer discusses the absence of British military authorities from the unveiling of a memorial to Jewish prisoners of concentration camps who were killed in the war and buried in the nearby woods. Perhaps they were absent, he writes because "they could not forget that those to whom the monument was being dedicated might, but for British perfidy, be living happily in Eretz Yisrael today."

I am amazed at the inflammatory character of this statement and disappointed to read it in the pages of THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST. The writer makes it appear that "perfidious Britain" was responsible for the murders in the the concentration camps. This is a fair example of the "hate England" campaign which some of our excitable co-religionists in America think will force Britain's hand.

I am not prepared to defend Britain's Zionist policy, nor is Winston Churchill, nor Mr. Crossman, nor are dozens of other British officials in and out of the government. Nevertheless, if I were writing for a national publication, I'd hesitate, deliberate and think again before leveling such serious charges at the British as your writer has done.

Historically, the charge is not true. If the writer seeks a scapegoat for the holocaust which Hitler made, why does he seek out the "perfidious British" who defended themselves, their islands, their way of life against the barbarous attacks of the Nazis? Were not the Jewish Legionaires and the British Tommies and the American G.I.'s and the Russian soldiers fighters against a common enemy? Why doesn't the writer take in a little more territory while he is about it? Why doesn't he blame all the men of Munich? (Chamberlain was only one of them). Why doesn't he blame those who were not there, those who were on the side-lines advising and haranguing? Or why doesn't he blame himself for not knowing how to read a crystal ball? Why doesn't he assess the blame upon all the civilized nations, our own included, that watched and to a certain degree nurtured the growth of National Socialism?

It is so unfair to single out the British. Furthermore it weakens rather than strengthens the Zionist position. The editor of a great American newspaper told me the other day, that he receives many letters written in the spirit of this little article. The writers want them printed in the "letters to the editor" department but this he will not permit.

"Not because I am afraid to print them," he explained, "but because this ranting, raving anti-British letter-writing would stir up anti-Jewish sentiment. I don't want to be a party to that. I have tried during a life-time to treat every minority, religious and racial, with respect and understanding. I can understand the bitterness, the threats, even the arrogance of these letters. I am deply sympathetic with the lot of the displaced persons and expressed myself vigorously in favor of opening the doors to our own country for many of them."

He had his office girl bring in the letter file and he extracted a few and showed them to me. "Would you as a rabbi like to see these in print?" he asked. I agreed that it would be unwise to publish them.

I return to your own articles, Mr. Editor. Which line do you propose that we follow? I hope that you will make it clear in your answer or comment on this letter.

NORMAN M. GOLDBURG
Rabbi, Congregation Israel, Brockton, Mass.

The item in "Realities and Values" does not imply that Great Britain is responsible for the slaughter of six million Jews. It merely implies that Great Britain might have saved many Jews from that slaughter but prevented their escape. That is a fact, and in view of Great Britain's moral and legal responsibility to facilitate the settlement of Jews in their national home, that is enough to justify what was said in the item criticized. It in no way, however, detracts from the point made in the editorial that, in negotiating with Great Britain, we must deal realistically and fairly with her problems and those of the Arabs as well as with those of our own people. EDITORS

SUPPLEMENT

In the Reconstructionist Movement

THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST YOUTH INSTITUTE

ONE of the most encouraging features in the history of the Reconstructionist movement has been its appeal to thinking Jewish youth. This summer, the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation accepted the challenge arising from this interest and sponsored a two-day seminar at Cejwin Camps, Port Jervis, New York. From applications which were received, the Foundation selected thirty young men and women in the age group of 20 to 30 to attend the seminar. They came from various parts of the country and constituted a good cross-section of American Jewish young people. A brief report of the seminar appeared in *The Reconstructionist*, Volume 12, No. 11 (Oct. 4, 1946). Reprints of this report may be obtained from the Foundation office, 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y., upon request.

The seminar resulted in the formation of the Reconstructionist Youth Institute which has adopted a full program of study and activity.

New York Chapter of the Institute

The members of the Institute resident in New York have organized themselves into the New York Chapter. The chapter meets monthly, invites a few guests, some of whom have already indicated their desire to join the Institute, and conducts a study course in Reconstructionism. At each meeting, the following program is followed:

One portion of the meeting is alloted to the discussion of the syllabus on the Philosophy and Program of Reconstructionism under the leadership of Rabbi Eugene Kohn. References are assigned which every member is required to read, and in addition, some members prepare papers on special topics bearing on the course.

Another portion of the meeting is assigned to the discussion of some specific problem facing Jewish youth today. At the November meeting the matter of *halutziut* for Palestine was considered. At the December meeting, the problem of the observance of Hanukkah and Christmas in the public schools will be the subject of discussion.

Another period is spent in discussing specific projects which are individually undertaken by members of the Institute. Some of these projects are: acting as leaders of clubs for younger people; planning material for publication in the bulletin of the Institute; engaging in research for the purpose of determining the efficacy of educational and organizational methods used by other youth groups in the United States; developing artistic projects, etc.

Between periods there are singing and dancing and the meeting ends with a social hour.

Tehiyah (Renascence)

Tehiyah (Renascence) is the bi-monthly periodical of the Institute. Originally intended to serve as the medium for reporting the activities of all Institute members, it has developed into a magazine of general interest to Jewish youth. The

editorial board is composed of Institute members who are eager to share their thoughts and ideas with all Jewish young people.

The contents of *Tehiyah* include articles of specifically Jewish interest, digests of pertinent articles appearing in the general and the Jewish press, editorials, book reviews, art and music notes, news commentary, comments on the study course undertaken by the Institute, recommended readings, and a report of each meeting of the New York Chapter.

Tehiyah is sent to every Institute member and to a carefully selected list of interested Jewish leaders and friends. Sample copies may be had upon request.

Institute Activities Outside of New York

In the original seminar group which set up the Institute, there were several people who came from communities outside of New York. These members are in constant touch with the central office. They report their activities, receive all materials circulated by the Institute, contribute their articles to *Tehiyah,* and are given full benefit of the study course prepared by the faculty in New York.

A careful transcript is made at each study meeting. This transcript, togther with the suggested assignments and readings, are then sent to every Institute member. The Institute member may ask for clarification of any point raised in the course, is furnished with the answers to all such questions, and receives test questionnaires on the course material. This correspondence course is free to Institute members. A nominal charge (for mimeographic and mailing service) of $3.00 for the course is made to all non-members of the Institute who wish to take advantage of this service.

Any Jewish young man or woman between the ages of 20 and 30, who is interested in such a study and action Institute, may obtain additional information concerning membership requirements from the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation.

—o—

RECONSTRUCTIONIST STUDY AND PROGRAM MATERIAL WIDELY USED

Our study syllabi, *Jewish Life Today,* based on Milton Steinberg's book, *A Partisan Guide to the Jewish Problem,* and the syllabus on the *Philosophy and Program of Reconstructionism,* are in constant demand by study and discussion groups. We receive many interesting letters informing us that these guides are invaluable for the use of the leader and the group. Each may be obtained from the Foundation.

Brochure—Zionism Explained

Our Booklet, *Zionism Explained,* which contains over 160 questions and answers on Zionism, has proved to be a unique contribution to Zionist literature. Many persons have written us that the booklet meets just the need of the individual or the group. Hadassah chapters, Reconstructionist study groups, Masada and Junior Hadassah units, and many independent discussion groups have been utilizing this pamphlet for discussion and as a source of information. An indication of the value of the booklet can be seen from some of the comments we have received. For example, Mr. Ernest E. Crown, chief of the Foreign Desk of the Newspaper *P.M.,* says: "I find your handbook *Zionism Explained* a useful document on numerous questions that arise daily in connection with Zionism." And Rabbi Maurice E. Schatz, director of the Hillel Foundation, Cornell University, says: "Your brochure is excellent and just what we have been looking for in our series of information for students."

To give you an idea of what is covered

n the handbook, here are some of the hapter titles: "Why Zionism?", "Politi-al Zionism," "Cultural Zionism," "Labor ionism," "Religious Zionism," "Social mplications of Zionism," "The Arab Op-osition," "Zionism and the American ewish Community," "Zionism and Chris-ianity."

Study Material in Preparation

Rabbi Jack J. Cohen, director of Fellowship and Youth Activities, is at work now preparing additional pamphlets which can be used for study purposes. One of the projected pamphlets deals with the problem of Jewish Education, particularly with the educational implications of Reconstructionism. This should prove a valuable guide for school boards and parents' associations interested in the education of our young people.

Another syllabus is being prepared now which takes up the study of the traditional Prayer Book and the Reconstructionist Prayer Book. Very often Jews do not understand the true meaning of the prayer books and the syllabus is intended to provide a guide for the use of such liturgical material.

Rabbi Cohen is also working on a guide to Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan's book, *The Meaning of God in Modern Jewish Religion.* We have had many requests for such an outline from varied sources. The syllabus should prove to be an important contribution to an understanding of the Jewish religion.

Cantatas

The Cantatas, "What Is Torah?" and "Our Bialik," both written by Ira and Judith K. Eisenstein, are still in constant use. They are both being presented before audiences that are widely distributed geographically and broadly diffused organizationally. Reform Temples, Conservative Synagogues and those of a Reconstructionist approach, use them for confirmation and graduation exercises. Community Centers present the cantatas as offerings meant to enhance their programs and to bring Jewish content through an artistic medium to the Center. Men's clubs, sisterhoods, women's auxiliaries use these cantatas at their public meetings. Many Hadassah chapters find that they have a real value when used as a means of fund raising. Hillel Foundations and other college youth groups have enjoyed presenting the cantatas.

Both cantatas can be easily presented. The running time is about 20 minutes for each piece. The costuming and scenic effects are very simple and the chorus of voices can be as large or as small as desired. We have the word of very many organizations located throughout the United States and in foreign countries that either cantata leaves an indelible impression on the auditors.

In a short time, phonograph records of "What Is Torah?" will be available for your use. Please watch for the announcement.

A New Cantata—"Seven Golden Buttons"

Early in the coming year, the new Eisenstein cantata for piano and chorus, "Seven Golden Buttons," will be ready for sale. Many of you may be familiar with the old Hasidic legend, "The Rabbi Laughed Three Times," upon which this cantata is based. This musical work is certain to equal, if not to exceed, the previous cantatas in popularity. Many of those who saw the initial production in May, 1946 proclaimed it the best of the three. Tuneful music, a gracious and moving story, and emotionally stirring lines, combine to make "Seven Golden Buttons" a rare event in Jewish musical history.

IN THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST WORLD

Chicago

Rabbi Melford Spiro is our very efficient and energetic organizer in the Chicago area. Working very closely with Mrs. Gabriel Dunkleman, he is organizing several Reconstructionist study groups in Chicago and its environs. At present there are two active groups, one adult and one youth. Several other groups are being organized in anticipation of the visit of Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan to Chicago in January.

The groups are studying Steinberg's "A Partisan Guide to the Jewish Problem" and "Creative Judaism." To quote from Rabbi Spiro's letter: "That two more groups will be organized is highly probable, if not certain. Furthermore, our influence is spreading indirectly. Our members are 'talking Reconstructionism' in their respective groups."

Kvutza—Brooklyn, N. Y.

Kvutza is our youth group in Brooklyn. It is an example of how strong can be the influence of a youth group upon any community. Earnest, sincere, devoted to the objective of making Judaism in America creative and meaningful, these young people who meet bi-weekly at the East Midwood Jewish Center, have established an enviable reputation. Their program is one of study and action. They initiate projects for themselves and set themselves to the fulfilment of self-appointed tasks. We are proud of the fact that several members of Kvutza, namely, Norman Schanin, Rosalyn Fleischer, Sheldon Feinberg and Marilyn Hochman, are members of our Youth Institute.

A few weeks ago, Rabbi Eugene Kohn, managing editor of *The Reconstructionist,* addressed Kvutza. He reports: "They put me through the paces but I had a thoroughly stimulating evening."

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Ben Silverberg, one of our returned veterans who is much interested in Reconstructionism, informs us that the study group which he organized last year with the help of Rabbi Alter F. Landesman will soon be resumed. The group will probably meet on Sunday evenings. All those who are interested in information about the group are urged to communicate with Mr. Ben Silverberg, 353 Warwick Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dr. Eisenstein's Visits

As in other years, Dr. Ira Eisenstein has proved to be one of our most effective propagandists. From whatever city he visits, we receive requests for materials, orders for books, applications for membership in the Foundation, and subscriptions to *The Reconstructionist.*

Recently Dr. Eisenstein addressed a group in Wilmington, Delaware, where he made many friends for the Foundation. He has visited Boston, Philadelphia, Bergen County, New Jersey, and other communities, and has addressed groups at Columbia University and the New York Hadassah leadership training course.

Rabbi Jack Cohen's Visits

Since October, Rabbi Cohen has had a heavy speaking schedule. He has addressed groups at Rodef Sholem Temple in New York, Yale University Hillel Foundation, Bronx B'nai B'rith Youth House, Hillel Foundation at the University of Maryland and will visit the University of Pennsylvania Hillel very soon. He has also spoken at the Bergen Hebrew Institute.

Rabbi Cohen also made a flying trip to Washington, Baltimore, and Arlington to visit our Reconstructionist friends in those localities.